

NO. X06-UWY-CV-18-6046436 S :	SUPERIOR COURT
ERICA LAFFERTY, ET AL :	COMPLEX LITIGATION DOCKET
V. :	AT WATERBURY
ALEX EMRIC JONES, ET AL :	MARCH 8, 2022
NO. X06-UWY-CV-18-6046437 S :	SUPERIOR COURT
WILLIAM SHERLACH :	COMPLEX LITIGATION DOCKET
V. :	AT WATERBURY
ALEX EMRIC JONES, ET AL :	MARCH 8, 2022
NO. X06-UWY-CV-18-6046438 S :	SUPERIOR COURT
WILLIAM SHERLACH, ET AL :	COMPLEX LITIGATION DOCKET
V. :	AT WATERBURY
ALEX EMRIC JONES, ET AL :	MARCH 8, 2022

### **Jones Defendants Reply to Mattei Affidavit**

Counsel for the Jones defendants takes no issue with the factual statements in the affidavit submitted by Attorney Christopher Mattei on March 2, 2022: It is a factual and accurate account of a meet and confer session intended to resolve potential discovery disputes arising from the production request directed to Alex Jones at his forthcoming deposition; it reflects the positions asserted by the parties. The parties succeeded in resolving many potential disputes at that conference.

One serious dispute remains, and judicial resolution of it prior to the deposition would materially assist the parties in expeditiously litigating this case to a conclusion.

In paragraph 11, the plaintiffs contend that “it is clear that cash coming into Free Speech Systems, LLC’s accounts was routed to third-party entities and then drawn down by Alex Jones. As such, the financial and organizational relationships between those entities is directly related to the various ways in which Alex Jones was able to obtain financial benefits from his mistreatment of the plaintiffs.” This may be the plaintiffs’ position; the defendants disagree with it. In either case, the issue is neither material nor relevant at this stage of the proceedings.

Of course, Mr. Jones denies mistreating the plaintiffs at all. They have, and they remain, free to listen to his content or not. Notwithstanding the default entered as to liability, the undersigned is aware of no admissible evidence that Mr. Jones caused any harm, either directly, or indirectly, to the plaintiffs in this case. Such evidence as has been adduced is speculative and untethered to any discernable theory of proximate cause.

What remains is a hearing in damages, where issues of causation remain contested. Discovery reasonably calculated to yield admissible evidence is appropriate, as is discovery intended to yield admissible evidence on how punitive damages, if assessed, are to be calculated. The plaintiffs contend that Mr. Jones profited from his “mistreatment of the plaintiffs.” Presumably, they intend to anchor punitive damages either in a theory of Mr. Jones’ net worth or his income and/or draw. They can proceed on either theory without the need to probe into affairs of non-party entities.

The plaintiffs’ contention that discovery is necessary to determine how money “coming into Free Speech Systems, LLC,” a sole member entity, and then flowed out to other entities, is not relevant to an assessment either of Mr. Jones’s net worth, or of his income. If money entered into Free Speech Systems, LLC, those funds are reported in the financial documents provided already in discovery. In other words, the plaintiffs already know what Mr. Jones’s draw was from the relevant period. Permitting a fishing expedition into entities in which Mr. Jones may, or may not, have a legal interest, is a side issue likely to yield litigation involving third parties.

The effort to trace every dollar that entered Free Speech Systems, LLC, is really akin to a collections action. That is premature at this point. Obviously, the plaintiffs hope for a large judgment. If they obtain it, the time for post-judgment collections will have arrived. The time will then have come to advance, and to attempt to prove, that the third

parties are what they suggest: alter egos of Mr. Jones'.

At the present time, the plaintiffs, despite the liability judgment, have made no effort to seek a prejudgment remedy, which would require them to do what they cannot - articulate probable cause for a theory of damages that proximately relates Mr. Jones' actual conduct to harm experienced by the plaintiffs. In this hotly contested case, the failure to seek such a remedy is telling.

The request for discovery about entities related to Free Speech Systems, LLC, is premature, and the production of documents by Mr. Jones as to these entities should be precluded.

In the event that the Court rules discovery as to the third-party entities to be appropriate, the undersigned requests an adjournment of Mr. Jones's deposition for a period of at least two weeks so that he can notify counsel for the third parties and those parties can, if they desire, seek judicial intervention on their own to protect their interests.

Dated 8 March 2022

Respectfully Submitted,

Alex Jones,  
Infowars, LLC;  
Free Speech Systems, LLC;  
Infowars Health, LLC; and  
Prison Planet TV, LLC

BY: /s/ Norman A. Pattis/s/  
/s/ Cameron L. Atkinson /s/  
Norman A. Pattis,  
Cameron L. Atkinson  
PATTIS & SMITH, LLC  
Juris No. 423934  
383 Orange Street  
New Haven, CT 06511  
V: 203-393-3017 F: 203-393-9745  
npattis@pattisandsmith.com  
catkinson@pattisandsmith.com

## **CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing has been emailed and/or mailed, this day, postage prepaid, to all counsel and pro se appearances as follows:

### **For Genesis Communications Network, Inc.:**

Mario Kenneth Cerame, Esq.  
Brignole & Bush LLC  
73 Wadsworth Street  
Hartford, CT 06106  
mario@brignole.com  
mcerame@brignole.com  
P: 860-527-9973

### **For Plaintiffs:**

Alinor C. Sterling, Esq.  
Christopher M. Mattei, Esq.  
Matthew S. Blumenthal, Esq.  
KOSKOFF KOSKOFF & BIEDER  
350 Fairfield Avenue  
Bridgeport, CT 06604

### **For Trustee Richard M. Coan**

Eric Henzy, Esq.  
ZEISLER & ZEISLER P.C.  
10 MIDDLE STREET  
15TH FLOOR  
BRIDGEPORT, CT 06604

/s/ Norman A. Pattis/s/  
Norman A. Pattis